

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,920	01/12/2001	Wayne Kelly	MCA-489 US	. 2777
7590 05/03/2005 MYKROLIS CORPORATION 129 CONCORD ROAD			EXAMINER	
			MENON, KRISHNAN S	
BILLERICA, MA 01821-4600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1723	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		,5
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/759,920	KELLY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Krishnan S. Menon	1723
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stal Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reserve within the statutory minimum of thirt od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15	<u> April 2005</u> .	
	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	•	
4) ☐ Claim(s) 32-59 and 61-78 is/are pending in the same state of the above claim(s) 32-57 is/are withdrest of the same state of the same	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyant ection is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Description: Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) 5) ☐ Notice of In: 6) ☐ Other:	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/759,920

Art Unit: 1723

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 32-59 and 61-78 are pending after the RCE of 2/17/04. Of these, claims 32-57 were withdrawn form consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 58-63,69-72, 74 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pall et al (US 4,431,545).

Pall (545) teaches a process for filtering a fluid containing charged particles comprising filtering through filters having nominal pore size between 0.1 and 10 microns and having zeta potential between 0 and -5 mV. (abstract, col 1 lines 15-24, col 2 lines 20-27: zeta potential less than 20 mV (absolute); col 3 line 25-col 4 line 15) as in claim 58. The membrane surface can be substantially neutral as in claim 59: instant application discloses zeta potential as between –10 and 10 mV for 'substantially neutral' in page 6; zeta potential less than 20 mV in the ref encompasses this range of 'substantially neutral'. LRV of at least 3 as in claim 60 and 61(see abstract). Neutral surface is inherent in one or more of the filters as in claim 62 (col 2 lines 20-27: small

Application/Control Number: 09/759,920

Art Unit: 1723

zeta potential). Formed by surface modification as in claim 63 (col 4 line 40-col 5 line 20; col 8 line 55 – col 10 line 25). Filter material is a polyolefin, or polyethylene as in claim 69 - 71 (col 8 lines 38-55). Two or more filters of different IEP as in claim 72 (see abstract). Treating with acrylic acid as in claim 74 (col 8 lines 50-55). LRV of at least 3 for particle diameters less than the pore dia as in claim 78 (col 13 lines 35-51).

Re the newly added limitation of 'each having a zeta potential between about 0 and -5 mV' in the independent claim 58, the claims are open-ended and therefore, do not preclude having other filters in addition to the 'one or more filters ... each having...'.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 64,65 and 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pall (545) in view of Mayhan (US 4,311,573).

Pall (545) discloses all the elements of instant claims as in claim 58. Instant claims add further limitations of the photoinitiator and cross-linking or grafting modification to the filter surface. Mayhan (573) teaches such modifications (abstract, col 6 lines 18-35, examples 4,5). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the Mayhan (573) teachings to modify the surface of the Pall

Art Unit: 1723

(545) filters as alternate but equivalent hydrophilic surface product for equivalent function because Mayhan (573) teaches these methods to improve the hydrophilicity of the membrane (abstract).

2. Claims 66 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pall (545) in view of McRay (US 5,582,725).

Pall (545) teaches all the limitations of claim 58 but does not disclose ceramics or metals as the filter media as in instant claims. McRay (725) discloses ceramics and metals as filter media (col 2:20-33). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could chose metal or ceramic materials as alternate but equivalent to the materials in Pall (545) teachings for the filters, and the metals could be stainless steel, etc., because they give increased filtration pressure resistance.

3. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pall (124) in view of Pall (US 4,430,479).

Pall (545) teaches all the elements of claim 17 as in claim 1 above, except the cellulosic materials for the filter. Pall (479) teaches using cellulosic filter for microporous membranes (col 1 lines 44-53). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the teaching of Pall (479) in the teachings of Pall (545) to provide a hydrophilic surface (Pall 545: col 8 line 68).

Art Unit: 1723

4. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pall (545) in view of Pall (US 4,617,124).

Pall (545) teaches all the limitations of claim 58. Claim 73 adds further limitation of filters being treated with monomers like acrylamide, which Pall (545) does not teach, but Pall (124) teaches. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the teaching of Pall (124) in the teaching of Pall (545) for cross-linking as taught by Pall (124).

Response to Arguments

No arguments were filed with the RCE or subsequent responses since 2/17/04.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S Menon whose telephone number is 703-305-5999. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/759,920

Art Unit: 1723

Page 6

Krishnan Menon Patent Examiner

W. L. WALKER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700